

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated February 3, 2010, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 are rejected. Claims 1-6 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the fourth paragraph on page 14, the paragraph bridging pages 17 and 18, the third paragraph on page 18, and the first paragraph of page 19 of the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

### **Entry of Response Proper**

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner as the Amendment merely clarifies the claimed features of the invention; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 6 is amended in a manner believed to be responsive to the rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 6.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Abe (JP 08282998 A, hereinafter “Abe”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a component transportation and installation device which transports and installs an installed component in an installation position of a receiving body comprising, among other features, a grip mechanism which grips the installed component, ***the grip mechanism comprising a dead man switch***, first actuator control means; and second actuator control means, wherein the dead man switch is ***configured to enable the first actuator control means when the dead man switch is not actuated and to enable the second actuator control means when the dead man switch is actuated***.

The Office Action asserts that Abe discloses all the features of Claim 1. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Abe does not disclose a grip mechanism comprising a ***dead man switch*** that is ***configured to enable a first actuator control means when the dead man switch is not actuated and to enable the second actuator control means when the dead man switch is actuated***. Rather, as stated

by the Office Action, Abe teaches a clutch (33) that switches between automatic and assisted control. Furthermore, Abe discloses that the drive unit (25) comprises the clutch (33), not the grip mechanism. See paragraph [0035] – [0037] and Figure 2.

Claim 2 recites a component transportation and installation method of transporting and installing an installed component in an installation position of a receiving body comprising, among other features, switching between an actuator automatic control step and an actuator assist control step at any time according to a work condition ***by actuating a dead man switch configured to enable assist control whenever the dead man switch is actuated and to enable automatic control whenever the dead man switch is not actuated, and wherein the dead man switch is configured to be actuated at every point during the transportation and installation.***

As discussed above, Abe does not disclose a dead man switch. Furthermore, Abe does not teach that the clutch is configured to be actuated at every point during the transportation and installation. Rather, Abe teaches that the mode must be automatic from (A) to (B) and must be assisted from (B) to (C). From point (A) to point (B) the gripping mechanism is in automatic mode. Then, once the gripping mechanism arrives at point (B), the gripping mechanism automatically switches to assist mode. The worker controls the gripping mechanism from point (B) to (C), performs his/her work, then manually returns the gripping mechanism to point (B). After returning the mechanism to point (B), the worker activates a switch and the gripping mechanism goes back to automatic and returns to point (A). See paragraphs [0035] to [0038] of the machine translation. Thus, because the installation apparatus of Abe can only be in automatic

mode from point (A) to point (B) and can only return to automatic mode when a worker returns the grip mechanism to point (B) and activates a button, the clutch is not configured to be actuated at every point in the installation process and does not act as a dead man switch.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Abe does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature recited by Claims 1 and 2.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every feature recited in a rejected claim must be disclosed by the applied art. For at least the reasons provided above, Applicants submit that Abe does not disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by pending Claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, Abe does not anticipate, nor render obvious, the subject matter recited by Claim 1 and 2. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Claims 1 and 2 should be deemed allowable over Abe.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Kiyuukazi (JP 2000210824 A, hereinafter “Kiyuukazi”) and Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Ishihara (JP 09210116 A, hereinafter “Ishihara”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 3-6 recite similar features recited by Claims 1 and 2, which are discussed above. For the reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that Abe does not teach or suggest the features of Claims 3-6. Kiyuukazi is cited merely for teaching automatic installing of a tire. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kiyuukazi does

not cure or otherwise address the deficiencies of Abe. Ishihara is cited merely for teaching a receiving body with pitch feed and installing two components in a stop period of one pitch feed. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Ishihara does not cure or otherwise address the deficiencies of Abe.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Abe in view of Kiyuukazi and the rejection of Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Abe in view of Ishihara.

## Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Docket Number 028359-00003.

Respectfully submitted,



Seth Barney  
Registration Number 61,187

Customer Number 004372  
AREN'T FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: 202-857-6000  
Fax: 202-638-4810

SB:vmh